UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,291	12/18/2000	David L. Hecht	07447.0013	2139

7590 02/17/2006

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVENUE S. XEROX SQUARE
20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER	
PIERRE, MYRIAM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2654	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/738,291	HECHT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Myriam Pierre	2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Amendment filed 012/23/2005, responding to the OA of 08/25/2005, proposed changes are approved by the examiner; IDS considered; amended specification, and amended claims 3-6 and 8-10.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Withgott et al. (5,748,805) can not teach receiving input text data indicating text of a document in a first-readable language. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach that the copier retrieves translation supplemental data, thus the copier had to inherently have the text document in the first-readable language in order to supply the translation supplemental data, and the merging elements are the machine readable code that is human-readable when rendered, Fig. 4 and col. 9 lines 50-59.

Applicant argues that "image unit" has nothing to do with encoding the translation data in a machine-readable code, wherein the machine-readable code is not human-readable when rendered. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The "image unit" is an identifiable segment of image such as glyph (col. 6 lines 38-42), which is a type of bit map and is not human-readable, and in order for there to be decoding of any bit map or image unit, there had to be coding of the image unit or bit map, and character coding is a type of encoding process, thus Withgott et al. do teach that the "image unit" is encoding the translation data in a machine-readable code, wherein

the machine-readable code (glyph) is not human-readable when rendered, col. 9 lines 59-67 and col. 10 lines 1-5.

Applicant argues that would be defeating the these objectives to encode the supplemental translation data in a machine-readable code, wherein the machine-readable code is not human-readable when rendered. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The supplemental translation data, when it is glyph or bit map coded, is not human-readable yet, since bit maps are binary numbers which are not human readable, but machine readable, col. 19 lines 19-25 and Fig. 4.

Applicant argues that Withgott et al. reference does not teach the merging step further comprising the step of superimposing the machine-readable code over the input text data. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach merging step via supplemental data which can be internal data within the document, the supplemental data or internal data can be stored as bit mapped image data, this bit mapped image data is inherently superimposing the input text, col. 10 lines 46-55.

Applicant argues that neither Fig. 3 nor any other part of the Withgott disclosure teaches that the said data including language translation data encoded in machine-readable code embedded in said image at such that the language translation data is not human-readable when said document is rendered. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach translation, Fig. 3 and col. 9 lines 35-45, and a merging step via supplemental data which can be internal data within the document, the supplemental data or internal data can be stored as bit mapped image data, this bit mapped image data is inherently superimposing the input text, col. 10 lines 46-55.

Applicant argues that the Office Action fails to teach where Withgott et al. teach receiving selection data indication a selected foreign language for translation of said human-readable text written in the first language. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach receiving selection data indication a selected foreign language for translation of said human-readable text written in the first language, Fig. 4, thus Withgott et al. do teach the step of producing a human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language using the language translation data encoded in said machine-readable code (bit mapping), col. 10 lines 46-55 and col. 9 lines 19-25.

Applicant argues that no mention is made of using an assist channel that assists in the identification of failures of the OCR operation. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach using an assist channel that assists in the identification of failures of the OCR operation, col. 9 lines 5-25, OCR operations inherently have assist channels such as spell check, in order to identify failures in the OCR operations.

Applicant argues that Withgott et al. neither teaches nor suggests that the supplemental data retrieved includes or comprises editing operation. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Withgott et al. do teach that the supplemental data retrieved includes or comprises editing operation, col. 9 lines 25-35 and Fig. 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Withgott et al. (5,748,805).

As to claim 1, Withgott et al. teach

receiving input text data indicating text of a document in a first human-readable language (Fig. 4, element 7);

performing a translation operation using the input text data to produce translation data indicating a second human-readable language translation of the first human-readable language (image units in connection with supplemental data, Fig. 4 element 45; col. 9 lines 6-8 and 15-22);

encoding (bit map) the translation data in a machine-readable code, wherein the machine-readable code is not human-readable when rendered (image unit, an identifiable segment of an image such as glyph, col. 6 lines 38-42);

merging the input text data with the machine-readable code to produce merged image data (direct retrieval using only image characteristic word unit recognition techniques may be performed in the case of supplemental data, which is also stored as bit mapped image data compatible with the image data of the source document to be supplemented, col. 10 lines 49-55 and col. 9 lines 28-29).

As to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Withgott et al. teach

the step of rendering the merged image data on a hardcopy document (col. 9 lines 25-31 and Fig. 4; merged image data is printed on the side of the hardcopy document).

As to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Withgott et al. teach

machine-readable code (bit map image) is code a self clocking (glyph) shape code (col. 6 line 38-41; col. 9 lines 28-32, and col. 10 lines 50-55; bit map image, "image unit" is glyph code shape; Fig. 4 element 45, supplemental data is the translation of element 7 and is a document image, the "image" is also an "image unit" and an "image unit" is glyph, the bit map "image" is machine-readable, thus the glyph is machine-readable).

As to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Withgott et al. teach

merging step further comprises the step of superimposing the machine-readable code over (adjacent) the input text data (documents containing supplemented (translated), adjacent the source document, col. 4 lines 64-65, col. 9 lines 28-29).

As to claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

receiving image data indicating a document (Fig. 4), wherein said document comprises human-readable text in a first language (Fig. 4 element 7) and at least one foreign language translation of said human-readable text encoded in machine-readable code (Fig. 4 element 45, supplemental data is the translation of element 7 and is a document image, the "image" is also an "image unit" and an "image unit" is glyph, the bit map "image" is machine-readable, thus the glyph is machine-readable)

receiving selection data indicating a selected foreign language (col. 3 lines 52-54 and col. 9 lines 44-46) for translation (Fig. 4 element 11) of said human-readable text written in the first language (Fig. 4)

producing a human-readable translation(Fig. 4 element 47) of said document in said selected foreign language (col. 3 lines 52-54 and col. 9 lines 44-46) using the machine readable code (col. 9 lines 28-32, and col. 10 lines 50-55; bit map image, "image unit" is glyph; Fig. 4 element 45, supplemental data is the translation of element 7 and is a document image, the "image" is also an "image unit" and an "image unit" is glyph, the bit map "image" is machine-readable).

As to claim 6, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

said machine readable code is glyph (col. 6 line 38-41; col. 9 lines 28-32, and col. 10 lines 50-55; bit map image, "image unit" is glyph; Fig. 4 element 45, supplemental data is the translation of element 7 and is a document image, the "image" is also an "image unit" and an "image unit" is glyph, the bit map "image" is machine-readable, thus the glyph is machine-readable).

As to claim 7, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

the step of receiving image data further comprise the step of performing OCR of the human-readable text (col. 10 lines 46-48).

As to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Withgott et al. teach

the step of utilizing an assist channel (bit mapped image data) to perform OCR (col. 10 lines 46-54).

Claim 9, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

the step of producing the human-readable translation further comprise the steps of:

identifying the machine-readable code (bit map) on the document that corresponds to the desired selected foreign language (bit map image data compatible with image data of source document to be supplemented (translated) col. 3 lines 52-54, col. 9 lines 44-46, and col. 10 lines 49-55).

decoding (bit map) the machine-readable code (col. 9 line 14 and col. 10 lines 50-54; decoded word units are matched; translation data or supplemental data is stored as bit mapped image, compatible with image data of the source language, thus inherently decoding the bit map or machine readable code by the system recognizing the compatibility of the translated text (bit mapped) to the source language (image data).

As to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Withgott et al. teach

translating the human-readable text to the human-readable translation of said selected foreign language (Fig. 4); and

inherently improving the human-readable translation of said selected foreign language using the machine-readable code (col. 3 lines 52-54, col. 9 lines 44-46, and col. 10 lines 49-55).

As to claim 11, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

wherein the language translation data encoded in the machine-readable code is complete human-readable translation of the human-readable text in a compressed form (Fig. 4 element 47); and

wherein producing the human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language using the language translation data encoded in said machine-readable code includes performing a decompression operation on the language translation data (Fig. 4 element 47 and col. 3 lines 52-54; col. 9 lines 28-32, 44-46 and col. 10 lines 50-55).

As to claim 12, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

wherein the language translation data encoded in the machine-readable code includes a plurality of editing operations (col. 9 lines 5-26; inherent editing in ORC operations); and

wherein producing the human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language using the language translation data encoded in said machine-readable code includes performing a machine translation operation of the human-readable text to perform a first translation (col. 3 lines 52-45; col. 9 lines 44-46 and Fig. 4 element 11); and

performing the plurality of editing operations on the first translation to produce the human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language (col. 9 lines 5-26; inherent editing in ORC operations).

As to claim 13, which depends on claim 5, Withgott et al. teach

wherein the language translation data encoded in the machine-readable code includes a correction code indicating correct word usage in the selected foreign language (col. 9 lines 5-26 and col. 3 lines 52-54; inherent correction code in ORC operations); and

wherein producing the human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language using the language translation data encoded in said machine-readable code includes performing a dictionary look-up operation of the human readable text perform a first word-for-word translation (col. 9 lines 19-25 and col. 3 lines 52-54); and

performing at least one editing operation on the first word-for word translation using the correction code to produce the human-readable translation of said document in said selected foreign language (col. 9 lines 5-26 and col. 3 lines 52-54).

As to claim 14, Withgott et al. teach

A method for generating image data for an output document, comprising:

receiving input text data indicating text of a document in a first human-readable language (Fig. 4);

for each one of a plurality of output foreign languages, performing a language translation operation using the input text to produce a set of language translation data (col. 9 lines 2-25 and col. 3 lines 52-54);

each set of language translation data indicating sufficient information for a compatible document image decoder to produce a translation of the first human-readable language into a second human-readable language (col. 9 lines 2-25 and col. 3 lines 52-54);

encoding each set of language translation data in a machine-readable code segment, wherein the machine-readable code segment is not human-readable when rendered as image data in the output document (col. 9 lines 2-25 and col. 3 lines 52-54);

producing primary channel image data representing the input text data in the fist human-readable language (image units in connection with supplemental data, Fig. 4 element 45; col. 9 lines 6-8 and 15-22);

the primary channel image data presenting the input text data as human-readable text when rendered as image data in the output document (Fig. 4 element 45 and col. 9 lines 6-8 and 15-22); and

merging the primary channel image data with the plurality of machine-readable code segments to produce merged document image data (col. 10 lines 49-55 and col. 9 lines 28-29).

As to claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Withgott et al. teach

generating image data for an output document wherein the language translation operation performs a complete translation of the first human-readable language into the second human-readable language (col. 9 lines 6-8 and 15-22); and

wherein the language translation data is a compressed version of the complete translation (col. 6 lines 38-42; bit map is a compressed version of the machine-readable code which is merged into image data).

As to claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Withgott et al. teach

generating image data for an output document wherein the language translation data produced by the language translation operation is editing data to be used for input to a set of post-translating editing operations (Fig. 4);

the set of post-translating editing operations to be applied after the compatible document image decoder performs a machine translation of the fist human-readable language into the second human-readable language (Fig. 4; and col. 9 lines 35-58).

As to claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Withgott et al. teach

generating image data for an output document wherein the language translation data produced by the language translation operation is correction data to be used to correct word translation errors by the compatible document image decoder after performing a dictionary-based word-for-word translation of the first human-readable language into the second human-readable language (Fig. 4 and Fig. 2 element 18; and col. 9 lines 35-58).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 a.m. - 2:00p.m.

6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7. Information as to the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MP 2/09/2005

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER